LABOUR MONTHLY

A Magazine of Labour Unity

Founded 1921

Editor: R. Palme Dutt

35th ANNIVERSARY

1921 · 1956

JULY

One shilling and sixpence

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BREAKING CHAINS

AS SOON AS the June number appeared readers began to send birthday greetings (and birthday presents!) for this, our 35th Anniversary Number. From an *East Anglian* household, where the father took to LABOUR MONTHLY during the General Strike, the son today sends 'wishes for many more birthdays, each one of which represents a further step towards the achievement of Socialism in our country. L.M. and I first met in 1926, when we were respectively five and nine years old—so its birthdays are as natural events to me as my own'. A *Labour Party pioneer* remarks what 'great hopefulness' there is today for 'our great adventure of making a new world of it'. From U.S.A. a reader notes that 'editor R.P.D. has his 60th birthday and his 35th anniversary as editor both together—so congratulations and respectful regards go with this small birthday present'. A *Labour Party councillor* recalls 'first meeting L.M. at a Foodship-for-Spain meeting; as yet I was not a member of the Labour Party. The man at the bookstall pressed me "just to try it". I did and have bought it ever since'. A small but cheerful social gathering was arranged at which Editorial Board, staff and contributors could have the benefit of meeting personally a cross-section of London readers. Some of the ideas and suggestions arising out of this will be discussed fully here next month.

The Value of Your Own Letters

AT THE MOMENT, however, I want to come back to some remarks I made last month; that no journal could reach the standard the movement deserves, let alone maintain it, 'without the advice, suggestions, support and exchange of ideas from its readers'. Two recent letters in particular have a special bearing on this. Amongst appreciative comments on the June 'Notes of the Month', a *London teacher* writes: 'It is very heartening to see that L.M. can take criticism seriously'; whilst a *Midlands reader* has a special point to make about the value of letters from readers in this column. This is how he puts it: 'Each month L.M. continues to astonish me with the range of its contents, the clarity of its message. Somehow it seems to remind me that I don't know all the answers! Yet in spite of the wonderful articles in each issue, I still find the message inside the covers claims *first* attention. It is the inspiration derived from the companionship evident in the letters from the world over—proof that all mankind is one'. Now that is very important. For it is all too easy dealing day by day with great and grave issues which move millions to appear to be overlooking the fact that the millions are made up of human beings, each one of whom carries far more than his or her own weight—

(*Continued on page iii of cover*)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XXXVIII, No. 7 CONTENTS July, 1956

	Page
NOTES OF THE MONTH: Thirty-Five Years, by R.P.D.	289
SOCIALISM AND CIVIL LIBERTY, by D. N. Pritt, Q.C.	302
CHECKING THE SCALES OF JUSTICE, by John Elton	310
BRITAIN'S SHAME IN CYPRUS, by R. Page Arnot	316
CURIOUS BUT FAMILIAR, by Sancho Panza	320
THE ENGLISH REVOLUTION, 1640, by V. Lavrovsky and M. Barg	325
EFFECTS OF MACHINERY, by Karl Marx	331
THIRTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY: Messages of Greeting	334
MORRIS ON SHAW	336
TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AGO	301
REMBRANDT DRAWINGS	312-313

Notes of the Month

Thirty-Five Years

'You cannot fight against the future. Time is on our side.'

GLADSTONE.

WITH this issue *Labour Monthly* completes thirty-five years of continuous publication. In the span of human development from the ape to Field Marshal Montgomery (who appears to consider that the species should finish with himself) thirty-five years is a speck—though these thirty-five years have probably seen more far-reaching changes than previous thousands of years. In the staid, or nowadays not always so staid, ranks of British monthly periodicals, some with distinguished century-old records, thirty-five years even under one editorship is nothing unique. But for an independent socialist periodical, which is not maintained by any organisation, subsidies or financial fairy godmother, and which is almost completely denied the normal advertising revenue that its five-figure circulation among a thoughtful, discriminating and reading public would justify, to have faced the blast of highly capitalised commercial competition, kept alive for over a third of a century and paid its way solely by the support of its readers who buy it, is a less usual phenomenon not without significance. Accordingly we hope our readers will bear with us if for a moment at the outset on the occasion of this anniversary we dwell, not on

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the political aims and principles for which we have consistently fought during these years from the beginning, the aims of socialism, international co-operation and labour unity, and the principles of living Marxism in the concrete conditions of our age (we discussed these more fully on the occasion of our thirtieth anniversary), but on this simple bare sordid economic fact of continued existence and survival, because this economic fact does contain a political lesson.

Mortality of Magazines

On May 18 this year the *Times Literary Supplement* in an editorial entitled 'Magazine in Trouble' lamented the threat to the continued existence of the *London Magazine*:

> At least 25,000 people will read this number. . . . And yet we read that for want of funds the paper may go the way of the *Criterion* and the *London Mercury*, that a print order of eight or nine thousand copies is insufficient to maintain the confidence of the backer, and that a circulation twice that of several Paris monthlies of established reputation fails to justify any longer the work which has been put into it.

The only solution the august journal of semi-official literary criticism (and obscurantism) can offer is to find 'solid backing', *i.e.*, financial subsidies to run at the loss nowadays assumed inevitable for a serious monthly periodical. Incidentally, on the same basis of computation of readership to sales, *Labour Monthly* readership would be in the neighbourhood of 40,000. This lament on the extending mortality today of often well-known and long established monthly magazines catering for a serious reading public has become a familiar feature of recent years.

> We shall mourn the *Fortnightly* but we can hardly be surprised that a small independent monthly of a complexion mainly political has found it impossible to survive without going into partnership with a competitor.
>
> (*The Times*, November 18, 1954.)

> How much does the closing down of *Britain Today* matter? It is primarily a publication of the British Council. . . . The 14,000 circulation contains very few complimentary copies. It costs £5,000 to £6,000 a year to maintain, and the British Council has decided that it must cease.
>
> (*Manchester Guardian*, October 22, 1954.)

It will be noted that in the latter example a monthly periodical with a circulation closely comparable to that of *Labour Monthly* is assumed to require a subsidy of five to six thousand pounds a year to survive. No subsidy or financial backer—no magazine: such is the deadly law now becoming regarded as axiomatic for serious monthly periodicals in capitalist Britain.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Ou Sont les Neiges d'Antan?

So, one by one, the old familiar names are disappearing. Where is X or Y or Z, so long beloved by many readers? 'Where are the snows of yester-year?' In their place has appeared the monstrous regiment of new overblown expensively produced and subsidised periodicals (our readers can fill in the names), openly paid for by American cold war finance to promote the cold war or by big publishing firms to run at a loss for purposes of prestige. This is no longer just the old question of the difficulties and hardships of socialist and progressive journalism in a capitalist press environment. The impossibility of solvency and economic survival of an ordinary capitalist monthly periodical of general interest for serious readers (even with the advantages of favourable publicity and advertising revenue), unless subsidies from financial backers can be found, is becoming the new assumption in the fiercely competitive conditions of the capitalist press world today.

Test of Solvency

It is in this context that the economic survival, solvency without subsidies, and expansion of circulation, solely by the support of its readers, of *Labour Monthly* during these thirty-five years takes on a certain wider significance. When we say that *Labour Monthly* pays its way, we do not mean the usual calculation of amateur periodicals, that if the costs of printing, paper and distribution are covered by sales, the magazine is solvent. We mean all the costs, not only printing, paper and distribution, but all the overheads, office rent, lighting, heating, telephone or wages of office staff and all the innumerable incidental costs (our writers, it should be said, are unpaid, in accordance with the tradition of socialist periodical journalism in this country), are paid for by sales to readers. Our readers help us with an invaluable supporting fund averaging £40 a month (in small donations publicly acknowledged each month); this enables us at the moment, since so far, despite steeply rising costs, our costs and sales just break even, to conduct promotion work to make our magazine more widely known in the labour movement; and the maintenance and extension of this modest fund is an indispensable safeguard against the prospect of further rising costs. The sacrifice this solvency imposes on our readers is expressed in the high price of 1s. 6d. we are compelled to charge; we hate this high price, since it inevitably restricts the circulation we could otherwise count on if we were even moderately endowed to make a lower price possible (the Labour Party's official monthly, inaugur-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ated long after the *Labour Monthly* to compete with it 'has to be subsidised' by the Labour Party, according to *The Times* (October 24, 1955)); but this is the price of independence. We would challenge any capitalist monthly periodical in the same class of serious periodicals to show a comparable record of solvency by the support of its readers, or, for the matter of that, within analagous conditions, a comparable circulation.

A Portent of the Future

In the giant world of daily journalism it is well known that current calculations assume that a sum in the neighbourhood of seven million pounds would be required to attempt to launch a new London daily newspaper. Indeed, no London daily newspaper has been successfully launched for more than forty years now except the *Daily Worker*. The recent attempt with inadequate finance was on the rocks in the shortest time. The Labour Party and Trades Union Congress, with all their resources of membership and finance, found it impossible to maintain a daily newspaper, even though they were able to take over the goodwill of one, the old *Daily Herald*, which had been originally founded by the militant movement in the teeth of opposition and denunciation by the official Labour Party leadership. In the light of these facts, and in this environment unique in the newspaper press of the world, the successful economic maintenance and continuance of the *Daily Worker* by the support of the workers now for over a quarter of a century is a miracle of the modern militant working class movement which already far surpasses the previous 'miracle of Fleet Street' of the old militant *Daily Herald*. And—if small things may be set alongside large—in the modest, but also lethally competitive world of modern monthly periodicals, the economic survival and solvency of *Labour Monthly*, by the support of its readers, in the midst of the death of so many of its contemporaries, and the failure of the Labour Party to maintain its monthly magazine without subsidies, is a phenomenon not without political significance. We know how much importance Lenin always attached to the measure of support of the working class press among workers as a real measure of political influence in the working class. By this measure we may say that the readership which has maintained over all these years the *Daily Worker* and *Labour Monthly* on an independent economic basis in a competitive capitalist world represents a serious element of the political forces of the future in Britain.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Thirty-five Years Ago

These thirty-five years in retrospect—for with all due modesty we can now claim to be the senior monthly journal of the left in Britain—have seen many changes. These changes have in their totality brought the world a long way forward towards the victory of the goals and aims for which our journal, in common with the progressive working class movement, has consistently fought from the outset. When our journal was founded, the first world war was still a recent memory. Lenin was at the height of his leading rôle in the working class. The Russian revolution was less than four years old; the wars of intervention were not yet ended; the New Economic Policy was being proclaimed by the all-knowing capitalist press as the final collapse of the 'socialist experiment'; Soviet Russia was still a predominantly peasant country; industrialisation and the fulfilment of the construction of socialism was still music of the future. Lloyd George ruled Britain. Britain ruled India. Britain ruled Egypt. Ruthless war against the Irish people had just come to its climax. The British Empire was reaching to its greatest extent with the new Middle Eastern Empire. Britain had just entered into the chronic economic depression which continued unbroken till war brought full employment. Black Friday had revealed the rumblings of the future general strike. Ramsay MacDonald was an agitator outside parliament. The Labour Party had 57 M.P.s and had not yet formed a government. Communists had still equal rights in the Labour Party, as members, as delegates or for selection as parliamentary candidates. The Communist Party, less than one year old, had, as its commission the following year revealed when it came to measuring hard facts against inflated claims, a dues-paying membership of 2,000. This was the Britain and the world into which *Labour Monthly* was born.

Thirty-five Years After

And now? Even the diehards can hardly fail to perceive that the world has changed against them. Communism leads one-third of the world. Twelve hundred million former colonial and dependent peoples have established their independent states; and despite the ferocious colonial wars still waged by the colonial powers against the remaining subject three hundred millions, and the attempt to impose new shackles through the bases, military treaties and economic intervention of the 'new colonialism', it is clear to all that the day of colonialism is drawing to its close. The new

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

independent states of liberated peoples move to economic co-operation and friendly relations with the socialist world. The imperialist sector has become visibly the minority sector of the world. India has risen to majestic stature as an independent world power on the side of peace, in close friendship with the Chinese Peoples' Republic and the Soviet Union, and, despite the still heavy legacy from the old colonial economy, is embarking now on its Second Five-Year Plan for economic reconstruction and the beginning of industrialisation; while the Communist Party of India, whose recent Fourth Congress has proclaimed the aims of national unity for peace, independence, economic and social reconstruction and democratic advance, has the support of six million electors and every prospect of increasing its poll at the coming election.

From the Old to the New

The economic success of socialism has been demonstrated beyond dispute by the fourteen-fold increase of the national income in the Soviet Union, and the twenty-fold increase of industrial production in a quarter of a century, as against a less than two and a half times increase in the United States, and a less than doubling in Britain and the capitalist world as a whole. The old argument is finished. It is now the panic fear of socialist economic superiority, of an educational system providing universal education up to seventeen years of age and higher education for two million students, of scientific and technical training and equipment outstripping every other country, that is paraded as the new 'red menace' by the capitalist world. In Britain three Labour Governments have not yet changed the domination of finance-capital or ownership of wealth by a tiny handful; but the experience has taught deep lessons for the working class, demonstrated in the present ferment of new currents and discussion. The Communist Party, grown seventeen-fold to thirty-four thousand—a minute figure yet in relation to its tasks, but already more than the old socialist parties which prepared the foundation of the Labour Party—has become the strongest organised section and independent voice of the left in the working class; and the most elaborate iron curtain structure of bans and proscriptions has been established in the vain endeavour to stem its advance. Despite all the still heavy conservatism of the oldest capitalist state, today, under the impact of world events, and of the breakdown of the old empire basis, new currents are stirring also in Britain.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Towards New Perspectives

Through these years a heavy price has had to be paid for the outcome of the policies of social democratic reformism and refusal of revolution in Western and Central Europe opening the gates to fascism and the second world war, with barbarities and horrors beyond description and the loss of tens of millions of lives. Humanity had to pass through its calvary to reach the present heights. During this abnormal period of strain, menace and cruel hardship, abhorrent evils also affected and stained the political structure of the Soviet Union and socialist freedom, alongside the heroic achievement. But, in spite of all, the cause of communism, of mankind, has won through, and goes from strength to strength. Today we are beginning to reach new conditions. The evils which affected the countries of the socialist world during this abnormal period are being corrected. A new approach is now being made to the whole problem of socialism and civil liberties; and in this connection we call attention to the important article by D. N. Pritt in the current issue, together with a report by John Elton of the recent international conference of Democratic Lawyers from 32 countries, including from the Soviet Union, which adopted a minimum programme for the protection of civil rights of citizens in all countries. This minimum programme (agreed by all the delegations, including the Soviet delegation with such representatives as the Vice-Minister of Justice of the U.S.S.R.) recommended among other things the abolition of the death penalty in peace time and the renunciation of the proclamation of states of emergency in peace time. It is significant that the Labour Party's recent policy statement on 'Personal Freedom' excludes the colonies.

Co-existence and Co-operation

Just as the wars of intervention failed, so also axis fascism failed and ended in utter collapse. The new revived Atlantic Axis of the past decade of the American cold war, which spawned its bases and military alliances over the world, shot up armaments to a staggering multiplication of all previous known figures, and brandished its nuclear weapons and threats of chemical horror over mankind, is now beginning to disintegrate and stagger into fiasco and discredit, not this time after war, but before reaching its outcome in major war. The united will of mankind for peace, the collapse of the illusions of Western military and nuclear superiority, and the calm strength and tireless pacific policy of the socialist

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

world, have begun to change the whole climate of international relations. The principle of peaceful co-existence is now universally recognised, even though the consequent necessary changes of policy have still to be carried through. There are new possibilities for understanding between the communist and non-communist worlds. There are new possibilities for understanding between socialists and communists, between all sections of the working class movement in all countries, for the common interests of peace and freedom of all peoples and the betterment of conditions, and towards the future aim of the advance to socialism throughout the world.

Optimism Without Illusions

In looking with justified confidence to the future, we cannot afford for one moment to blind our eyes to the continuing dangers. Although the principle of peaceful co-existence has been recognised, nothing has yet been changed in the policies and strategic set-up which are based on the premises of nuclear war. Nato may be politically weakened; but the entire vast installation of airfields, bomber bases and strategic commands continues, ready to be brought into operation at the drop of a hat if some trigger-happy American Supreme Commander misreads the significance of some local incident (let it never be forgotten that the Western strategy is now officially declared to be for nuclear war also in the event of local 'aggression', and 'aggression' has been officially defined as not necessarily implying any military action by the other side). Hitler's generals and the Ruhr monopolists who made the second world war are now openly and exultantly on top in Western Germany. The Baghdad Pact in the Middle East, Seato in Eastern Asia, Chiang in Formosa or Rhee in Korea, all represent powder-mines which could explode at any moment. Field Marshal Montgomery has declared on June 1:

> If anyone anywhere in the world started aggression, we should give them the works from the word go with atom bombs, hydrogen bombs, with the biggest thing we've got and with everything we've got.

Note well. Not nuclear war in answer to nuclear war. But Western nuclear war first, in answer to any local 'aggression', defined as any local political incident regarded by the West as equivalent to 'aggression'. This Montgomery declaration is not just the raving of a mountebank, but has been officially endorsed, not only by the Tory Government, but by Shinwell on behalf of the Labour Party.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Senator George's Warning

Leaving aside the firebrands, we should do well to note the serious warning of Senator George after his retirement from the position of Chairman of the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee. It was Senator George who played the main part in urging on President Eisenhower participation in the Geneva Conference of Heads of States last year, as also in the initiative for the ambassadorial negotiations with China.

> It may be stated on the basis of conversations with Mr. George that he is sombrely convinced that Western policy in general and United States policy in particular suffers from a certain negativism and drift, and that unless world currents are altered war with the Russians would be likely within three years. (*New York Times*, May 18, 1956.)

This is not the phantasy of an alarmist, but a very considered warning from one who has been the most prominent United States protagonist of peaceful co-existence influencing the policy of President Eisenhower. The warning does not mean or suggest that war is inevitable. But it does underline and emphasise the truth that we cannot sit back and enjoy the improved climate in international relations as the guarantee of peace. If we want peaceful co-existence, we have got to work for it, and to translate it rapidly into the essential concrete changes of policy—disarmament, the banning of nuclear weapons and tests, the replacement of sectional military alliances by collective security in Europe and Asia, the ending of colonial wars, the representation of China in the United Nations, and the lifting of strategic bans on trade—which can alone make peaceful co-existence effective and durable.

Must Britain Lag?

And what of Britain? Can we say that the lesson of these thirty-five years has yet been learned in Britain? The old basis of empire monopoly has dwindled. Financial and strategic superiority in the imperialist world has passed to the United States. Since the thirties chronic deficit on the balance of payments has recurred. The hungry thirties of mass unemployment left a bitter memory. But by 1953 food consumption per head of meat, fish, butter, sugar, cereals, fruit and vegetables was below the level of 1934-38, that is, below the level of the hungry thirties; only consumption of potatoes and milk had increased. Even official government statistics, published last year, could only claim that between 1938 and 1954 output per head had increased by 12 per cent., while consumers' expenditure per head had increased by $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. during these

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

same sixteen years. What a staggering contrast with the achievement of socialism! Nor is the reason far to seek. There is no lack of industrial experience and skill in Britain, or the unrivalled working capacity of the industrial working class of Britain. But this skill and labour have been wasted by Britain's rulers. Britain's rulers, whether Conservative or Labour Imperialist, have failed Britain. They have directed all their efforts to endeavour to shore up the bankrupt imperialist basis in place of facing the tasks of new construction corresponding to Britain's changed position in the world. Hence Britain's economy has been geared to the heaviest arms expenditure in proportion to population of any major country in the world, to endless colonial wars and mounting overseas military expenditure, to the madness of the cold war, to dependence on the United States, and bans on trade. Under Conservative and Labour Governments alike through these eleven years since the war Britain has staggered from crisis to crisis.

Deadly Contradiction

On the one hand, the Foreign Secretary, Selwyn Lloyd, now admits that the myth of the supposed 'Russian military menace', in the name of which the people were called on to go short, forego the results of their increased output and submit to the staggering rearmament costs, American military occupation, Nato and all the rest of it, was all an illusion, and that the real menace is economic:

> The Russian steamroller of today is not likely to be a military one. It consists of a great mass of technicians, technologists, teachers, business and other experts.
>
> (Selwyn Lloyd's interview to the Italian press, May 21, 1956.)

What a menace! Or what a 'steamroller'! But if Britain's problem and backwardness are recognised to be economic, the conclusion might appear to follow that Britain should begin to end its present military waste of reserves and concentrate on the urgent tasks of peaceful economic reconstruction.

Road to Ruin

Not at all. Ten days later Prime Minister Sir Anthony Eden proclaims that Britain's inflated armaments, overseas military expenditure and colonial wars are the only alternative to economic ruin and mass hunger:

> No Cyprus, no certain facilities to protect our supplies of oil. No oil, unemployment and hunger in Britain. It is as simple as that.
>
> Our country's industrial life and that of Western Europe depends today, and must depend for many years to come, on oil supplies from the Middle

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

East. If ever our oil resources were in peril, we should be compelled to defend them. The facilities we need in Cyprus are part of that defence. We cannot therefore accept any doubt about their availability.

The standard of living of every single person in Britain would not then be doubled in 25 years; it would be quartered in a much shorter time.

(Sir Anthony Eden, speech at Norwich, June 1, 1956.)

It does not occur to him that to incur the hostility of the entire Middle East along the doomed path of attempted military domination is the surest way to lose the supplies of oil, which would be plentifully available under peaceful conditions. The old Roman poet spoke of those who for the sake of life lose the reasons for living. It has been left to modern Tory Governments to ruin Britain economically in order to avoid economic ruin.

Macmillan's Pipe Dream

To complete the deadly contradiction of British ruling class policy today, the Chancellor of the Exchequer indulged last month in what he described as a 'pipe dream'. He said:

In 1954 we in Britain devoted 9 per cent. of our national income on defence. The figure for all other O.E.E.C. countries put together was 5 per cent. Compared with the rest of Western Europe, Britain is devoting nearly twice as large a share of her resources to defence. Heavy military expenditure overseas has risen very fast in the last five years. In 1950, overseas military expenditure was about £100 million, and last year it was just on £150 million.

Contemplating these figures, the Chancellor indulged in some 'speculative arithmetic':

Supposing our figure was 5 per cent., not 9 per cent. I think this particular piece of speculative arithmetic is illuminating—indeed tantalising. It would mean a saving of £700 million, and if only half of that were shifted into exports, it would completely transform our foreign balance. And if we got the other half shifted into fixed investment there would be a good deal less critical comment about our low investment percentage.

Reduce defence spending by £700 million, and it would resolve one of the Treasury's main dilemmas—that it is dangerous to reduce taxes until we get more savings.

Of course, Mr. Macmillan added, this was only

a pipe dream. We know that we can't have it. We are not going to behave in an irresponsible way.

(Harold Macmillan, speech to Foreign Press Association in London, May 16, 1956.)

All the myths of excessive home consumption as the cause of the deficit on the balance of payments have here disappeared in this illuminating heart cry of a Tory Chancellor of the Exchequer. He sees the possibility of even a partial change from the imperialist war

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

policy as a 'tantalising' solution to his problems—only to be dismissed as a 'pipe dream'. But the real situation cannot be so easily dismissed.

Ball At Our Feet

Never was the opportunity so wide open for the entire labour movement and all honest representatives of the people to press the fight for an alternative policy. The Labour candidate at Tonbridge in the most significant and widely discussed by-election result since the general election has told us that he slashed the Tory majority by five-sixths in this Tory stronghold on the basis of a programme of

> Fighting the Tories on every immediate (and past and future) issue; against continuing the cold war; against German rearmament; against bearing a £1,500 million yearly arms burden; against colonial repression; against domination by the U.S.; and against exploitation of man by man in any way.
>
> Fighting for the public ownership and control in the common interests of the country's basic industries and services; for the stabilisation and reduction of the cost of living; for more workers' participation in the control and management of industries and services; for the right of the common people to enjoy more well-earned leisure in cultural, recreational and educational pursuits.
>
> The insistence that all of these are part of the struggle to replace capitalism by Socialism in Great Britain.

If this were the official programme of the Labour Party today, and were campaigned for by the whole movement, the conditions would be present for the most rapid advance to victory over Toryism. Tonbridge has demonstrated that this is no mere theory of left supporters, but practical common sense. The electors will respond to a positive alternative policy from Labour. They are not interested in Second-hand Toryism.

United for Victory

Is such a programme yet recognised by the official labour movement? Unfortunately not yet. The policy of the present official Labour Party leadership contradicts the programme of the Tonbridge candidate on almost every particular (for the cold war; for German rearmament; for the rearmament programme; for the colonial wars; for the American military occupation of Britain; and dilly-dally-wobble on socialism). The conclusion is clear for all socialists and serious labour men and women. We must strive to win majority support among all sections of the labour movement for such a positive alternative programme which can alone defeat

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Toryism and begin to carry our advance forward. This will require the united strength of all of us who desire such an advance in policy, communists and non-communists alike, working together, since every section has an indispensable and valuable part to play. Such co-operation has already begun to develop (the venomous fury of the capitalist press against the advance of such co-operation in the trade unions is already manifest) and will further develop. Let socialists and all progressive men and women in the Labour Party, who may not agree with the principles of communism, but who desire the victory of a left policy, recognise that the Communist Party and its daily newspaper is a positive political force in this common battle of the left, an ally and not an enemy. Let communists, at the same time as they emphasise the indispensable necessity, in their view, of an organised political party based on Marxism within the broad working class movement, recognise equally the indispensable rôle of all socialists and progressive fighters in the trade unions and Labour Party, even though these may not share their views on many issues. Let us go forward together for a common victory.

June 19, 1956. R.P.D.

FROM THE *LABOUR MONTHLY* OF 25 YEARS AGO

AN APPEAL THAT SUCCEEDED

The *Labour Monthly* has survived ten years. But, quite frankly, the survival has not been easy, and gets harder each month. It is not that our friends and supporters have diminished, if we may judge from circulation and from the encouraging letters received from many countries. But those with money have diminished, and we must be prepared for them to diminish still further, as the fight grows sharper. Some who may read these lines will be already helping us to the full extent of their capacity, and more. We wish to express our thanks and debt to these. To their donations, and to the voluntary work of all concerned with the *Labour Monthly*, its survival these ten years is due. But there are others who may be able to help, who are interested in the *Labour Monthly*, who would be sorry to see it come to an end, but who do not know against what difficulties each number is brought out. The *Labour Monthly* is produced for the barest printing, paper and distribution costs. All service on it is voluntary; no writer is paid. Nevertheless, owing to the difficulties of getting advertisements, there is still a net deficit of £20-£25 a month to be met. This is met by a system of guarantors—friends in England, the United States, Canada, Australia and South Africa, who guarantee us a monthly donation of what they are able, ranging from 1s. to £2 a month.

July, 1931.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOCIALISM AND CIVIL LIBERTY

D. N. PRITT

THE whole question of Civil Liberty in Socialist countries is of considerable importance, not merely because all forms of liberty (of which civil liberty is but one) are vital to human happiness and progress, but on a smaller scale because the allegation that there is no civil liberty in Socialist countries, and in particular in the U.S.S.R., is one of the more insidious and successful—and of the more insolent and shameless—of the anti-Soviet propaganda lines put about among intellectuals and right-wing Labour circles in Britain. It is thus worth while to make a serious study of civil liberties in the U.S.S.R., which we may take as the prototype of a Socialist state.

It is idle to try to formulate a definition of civil liberty. It is a somewhat loose description; it is indeed somewhat easier to recognise civil liberty when one sees it than to describe it. Here one can do little more than give examples of what is generally regarded as Civil Liberty. It covers the right to hold and express political or religious opinions; to suffer no persecution, discrimination or disadvantage on account of one's opinions, religious beliefs, colour, sex or race; to be free to live where one will, to travel and to cross frontiers where one will; to hold public meetings, processions and demonstrations; and not to be imprisoned except after conviction at a criminal trial honestly conducted, in which one has had full opportunity to know and to answer the accusations, and to have defence counsel.

There are necessarily very wide differences of approach between capitalist and socialist countries on problems of liberty in general and of civil liberty in particular. What is surprising, indeed, is not that there should be differences, but that the actual liberties specifically proclaimed—as realities or objectives—in both worlds have such a large degree of outward resemblance.

A capitalist state of the democratic type (and there are only a few of them of this type) proclaims and seeks the liberties which seem good to that small minority of its citizens who form its ruling class; the freedom to trade, to employ or not to employ, to work if someone will employ you; to strike or to lock-out; to exploit, to invest; to own property in land and in the means of production, to buy or sell such property freely, and to live idly on the labour

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of others if your property permits; to express opinions, to exercise (if you can) monopoly rights and powers in relation to the public expression, distortion, and suppression of opinion, whether in the press or over the air; to travel if you can afford; to live where you can afford. Such a state, if of the democratic type aforesaid, will further proclaim, but will not 'strive officiously' to establish, freedom from discrimination on the ground of opinion, belief, colour, or race. (Here I ignore for the moment the question whether there exists the material basis for the fulfilling of these civil liberties.)

Moreover, in a capitalist state civil liberties tend to be regarded —it is perhaps their best feature—as something which the citizens possess as a shield against governments which (being executive committees of the minority ruling class) are thought of as *prima facie* hostile to the majority of the citizens. There is a profound historical reason for this. The doctrines of civil liberty in England, for example, were first asserted and fought for on a large scale by the bourgeoisie in their struggle against the stifling tyranny of the feudal state in its final, absolutist form of the Stuart monarchy. The modern working class, directly it began to come into existence in the second half of the 18th century, took up the fight against the far more efficient tyranny of the bourgeois oligarchy—the Pitts and Castlereaghs, the Disraelis and Salisburys: and really all our present-day civil liberties, so far as the mass of the people are concerned, have been won by the struggle of the working class over the last 150 years.

A Socialist state proclaims and seeks the liberties which seem good to its ruling class, that, is, to the whole community; the freedom to work, and live, and eat; to develop one's own personality; to have work congenial to one's desires, to have education, leisure, holidays; to preserve one's own national, cultural, and linguistic characteristics and peculiarities; to be cared for in illness, incapacity and old age; to have the reality of all these freedoms secured to each citizen by all the wealth and power of the community; to be free completely and for ever from any disability of any kind due to one's opinions, beliefs, sex, race or colour; and to express opinions freely, with as full access as anyone else to the means of public expression.

Moreover, civil liberty tends to be regarded in a socialist state not as a shield against the government, which is the government of all citizens except a tiny proportion of subversive elements, but as something inherently good in itself, alike for the citizens and for

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the government, and maintained willingly and as a matter of principle by the government, whose conscious purpose is to work for the betterment of the lives of all its citizens, free of the tasks of capitalist governments to uphold one side of the class struggle against the other and the interests of the minority against those of the majority.

To these statements of the attitudes of the two worlds, there must of course be added, for each of them, the deep and important qualification that no régime, feudal, capitalist, or socialist, or of any other existing category, can or will, ever allow any citizen or group of citizens to use their liberties for the purpose of destroying the state. Be the state liberal or reactionary, predominantly rural or highly industrialised, backward or highly-developed, capitalist, transitional, or Socialist, it will inevitably, when its existence, or even its power, is threatened, take measures to defend itself, and will suspend temporarily or permanently any civil liberty which might help subversive elements to work against it, as surely as an army in the field will blow up a building, regardless of its architectural value, if it gives cover to the enemy. One has only to recall the attitude of the British Government in Ireland, Kenya, Malaya, British Guiana, or Cyprus, of the Prussian and many other European governments in 1848, and of the Soviet government in 1918, when counter-revolution raised its ugly head against the new-born state, to realise what happens, and must happen, in such events.

It is, indeed, worth noticing the significance of the history of civil liberty in Britain and its colonies, and in the U.S.A., as illustrations of the way in which civil liberty has to be won and maintained, and of the encroachments upon it made by capitalist governments in times of weakness or fear. In Britain we have the example of oppressive legislation like the Six Acts, and warlike action like the Peterloo massacre, whenever the ruling class has felt insecure; and only public opinion has restored, after a time, some measure of civil liberty.* In the Colonies, relatively unchecked by public opinion in the distant homeland, and conscious of their minority position, British rulers have almost always done their utmost to hold civil liberty down to an irreducible minimum. And in the U.S.A. in the last decade civil liberty and the right to dissent have been largely destroyed under the neo-Fascism associated with the name of McCarthy; the situation in Britain is

*Only to be assailed again, as when (against the opposition of the Labour Party) the parliament of 'hard-faced men' passed the Emergency Powers Act of 1920 to suppress strikers, not to speak of the Official Secrets Act of 1921 which, in violation of traditional civil liberties, compelled suspected persons to answer under questioning.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not deteriorating so strikingly, but is bad enough. It must not be overlooked that Capitalism is always creating greater tensions, always threatening the human dignity and happiness, the very existence even, of the majority of its citizens with unemployment, underemployment and crisis, and always moving nearer to Fascism and War. It would be astonishing if in such a system civil liberty were not under constant attack. That the upholders of such a system should talk of the 'free world', 'Western values', 'Western civilisation' and democracy, is really so maddening to honest men that it amounts to what the policeman would call abusive language likely to cause a breach of the peace.

But Socialist states are, and must be, different. How should we expect the first Socialist state to behave in the field of civil liberty? And how has it in fact behaved?

It is easy to see what one should expect. The Socialist world seeks to establish real freedom, freedom from exploitation and all the other evils that have unnecessarily tortured the world for so long. It is freer than the 'free world' (called 'free', I suppose, in the same way as the Kings of England were called Kings of France until early in the last century), more Christian than the Christianity known as 'Western values'. Civil liberty, normally distasteful to a capitalist government, is to the Socialist outlook a natural part of man's advancement to true and full freedom. It is in this context that one can fully understand the assertion of Professor Bernal that Communists are the heirs of the liberal tradition.

We thus expect a Socialist state (subject to the imperfections and mistakes which are inevitable in human development) to develop civil liberty in a high degree; but we expect it at the same time to defend its Socialist advance against all its enemies, external or internal (including internal elements that may be subverted from outside), and in that defence to abrogate civil liberties so far as may from time to time be necessary.

That is what we should expect. How has the Soviet State, in fact, behaved? It has, subject to imperfections and mistakes, behaved exactly as one should expect. The fullest liberty of the press and other liberties were conceded from the very start of the new régime in 1917. Tsarist generals were set at liberty, on promises that they would not take up arms against the State—promises, of course, promptly broken; and old-régime civil servants were left in their offices. It was only when it became clear that these liberties were being abused, to the peril of the new state; it

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was only when the monarchists and landlords, the army generals, the capitalists, the civil servants, not only sabotaged the new government in every way open to them, but also took armed action against it, invited foreign armies to invade Soviet territory, and plotted the murder of prominent Bolsheviks (plots and treasons, unfortunately for the credit of the old Socialist International, participated in by nominally socialist parties) that the Extraordinary Commission was set up, and many civil liberties were, inevitably, abrogated in order that the Socialist state should be kept alive. As the years went by, the danger of subversion lessened, and alas! increased again, from time to time especially following the growth of fascism in the centre and west of Europe; and with these changes civil liberties fluctuated, never being as full as Socialists would have wished it possible to make them, and never, of course, as bad as anti-Soviet propagandists pretended. But the aim was always to restore and reinforce liberties whenever the danger of subversion (always gravely underestimated by even friendly observers in the outer world) diminished; and it is significant that as early as 1936 the new Constitution expressly proclaimed the independence of judges, the right to work, the right to rest and leisure, the right to maintenance in old age, sickness, and loss of capacity, equal rights of women in all spheres of life, equal rights for all citizens, freedom of conscience and religious worship, freedom of speech, of the press, of meetings, of street processions and demonstrations.

And, of course, the Socialist state sought to make all these freedoms a reality; the paragraphs of the Constitution which provide the machinery for that purpose make interesting reading, but are too long to be quoted here. And the remarkable institution of the Procuracy (often misdescribed as 'chief Prosecutor's office') is a striking testimony to the reality of freedom and of the desire and intention to secure and extend the reality of freedom and the rule of law, subject always and only to the overriding necessity to preserve the state from subversion. (The Procuracy, established in the early days of the state, has the duty to secure, by the use of its extensive powers of interference and supervision over every organ of the state, that all such organs do their work not only efficiently but also in full accordance with the law. Exceptional measures are provided in the Constitution to make the Procuracy independent and all-powerful, and to the extent to which it works properly every citizen's liberties are safeguarded against abuse by any organ of the government).

The development towards fuller civil liberty in the Soviet Union

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was a healthy one for many years, particularly when one remembers the incessant and wide-spread efforts of Western Powers to subvert the state from within, after they had learnt that they could not destroy it from outside. But we know now that, for a time, from 1935 onwards till early 1953, the development went wrong and that there were tensions, hardships, rigidities, grave cruelties and injustices, and undue suppression of liberties—undue in the sense that it was greater than required for the security of the state. How did this come about? There was a combination of causes. One lay in the very nature of 'security' organs. Those charged with maintaining security, and anxious above all things to avoid risks, tend to think departmentally of security as an end in itself, to become dictatorial, to forget the importance of maintaining always the maximum possible degree of healthy civil liberty, to demand or usurp power over bodies designed—like the Procuracy—to check them, and even to override the law. Such things are, alas! only too likely to happen; they have happened in almost every country and almost every period of history. It is easy for the enemies of the state to disguise subversive activities as legitimate criticism; and it is correspondingly easy for zealous and anxious security forces to mistake honest and legitimate criticism for subversion. And all these evils and dangers are intensified, when subversion is financed and developed and carried on on a vast scale by powerful enemies from outside.

The danger of abuse in such circumstances is very great. The only true safeguard lies in vigilant collective leadership, in the efficient working of an alert Communist Party, in a lively and well-educated public opinion, and in the provision and use of good machinery for enforcing the law. All these benefits were provided and for a long time fully maintained. But there was nevertheless imperfection and failure with tragically grave results. They came about mainly because Stalin, burdened by immense responsibilities, and carried away by the very successes of the struggles over Socialist policy which he led, departed from the true and proper conduct of state business through the machinery and with the safeguards I have described. He substituted to a considerable extent individual decision for collective leadership; and then, seeing (after the assassination of his colleague and closest friend Kirov) greater dangers to the security of the state than its enemies (furious indeed, but ever weaker in numbers and power) represented in reality, permitted or directed stronger and wider and more rigid security measures than were necessary or useful.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is tragically easy for leaders who cease to maintain intimate and sustained contact with the people, and thus no longer consciously depend upon and trust in them, to put their confidence in security forces instead, and to distrust people who in truth deserve the fullest confidence. And one of the most tragic aspects of such a situation is that it can be taken advantage of—by those in charge of the security organisation—as a screen for pursuing their personal ambition by illegal and inhuman methods. Honest and legitimate criticism by outstanding men and women with a long Socialist record was, by 1937-8, often misrepresented as subversion to serve those ambitions.

The errors and abuses that resulted were very grave; but no thoughtful Socialist expected that this great Socialist state would be built in the face of its many and powerful enemies without mistakes and set-backs and troubles, and we can now look forward with confidence to a new advance—which has indeed already begun—in the fields of civil liberty and liberty generally. True to the tradition of the widest and truest liberty with which the Socialist state must be imbued because it is Socialist, the U.S.S.R. can now surpass or overtake other countries in that field as it is surpassing or overtaking them in so many other fields, cultural and material.

Beginning with July, 1953—when the activities of the security organisation began to be subjected to searching review—a series of important measures to promote this was taken. All extra-judicial machinery for trying and sentencing citizens was finally swept away. Thousands of cases dealt with by that machinery began to be reviewed, and the persons concerned rehabilitated and, if alive, compensated. The Procurator's Office was given new powers (and duties), for the protection of individuals under investigation or already sentenced. Parallel with this there was developed—during the two and a half years before the XXth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union—an intense campaign exposing the evils of the 'great-man cult', and encouraging people to criticise and question without fear, high and low. All this has begun to bear fruit.

One interesting example of the way in which the work of correction and improvement has begun is to be found in a little-publicised decision of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., made on the 7th April, 1956, to tighten control over the activities of Security organs by establishing a special division in the Procurator's office to 'supervise the investigations' of the state security organs.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(On April 19 there followed the formal repeal of the draconic laws of December 1, 1934, and September 14, 1937.) This means that the officials of the Procuracy, invested with great powers of inspection, interference and investigation, and rendered by the Constitution itself independent of any organ whatever of government except only their own Procurator-General, will be entitled to check over and control all the work of every security organ, in the same way as they check over and control the work of every ministry, factory, hospital, prison, and all the rest of the manifold activities of the great Socialist state.

In the light of the new developments, we can look forward confidently to a new flowering of liberty in the U.S.S.R. Mistakes and abuses may, of course, still occur; but the education, the philosophy, the principles, and the machinery which serve the cause of liberty and human dignity in the Socialist state must now be stronger and clearer than ever, and Socialists can, and must, feel that the danger of error is smaller than ever before, and that the forces of human freedom can resume their triumphal march. Civil liberty suffered set-backs, but never disaster, whilst it lived in the context of capitalist encirclement; the Socialist states are no longer isolated but form part of a great system embracing nearly half the world, it will soon flourish more freely and more widely than would have been thought possible even a few years ago.

The situation is, of course, greatly improved, both in the U.S.S.R. and in the new democracies, not only by the recognition and exposure of past errors but still more by the return of the first socialist state to the correct path of collective leadership and contact with the people. The new developments are also of great help to us in Britain,, in the struggle, now more important than ever, for unity of the Labour forces. The greater and more general friendship with the U.S.S.R. makes friendly contact with Communists easier; those who have sincerely found obstacles to friendship in the measures of security employed in the U.S.S.R. are now reassured; and those anti-Soviet propagandists who used accusations of lack of civil liberty as one of their more successful propaganda weapons will at any rate lose that weapon.

It is perhaps fortunate that we have a tradition of civil liberty in Britain. Whether we deserve that tradition or not, it will help us not only to look forward to an advance towards Labour unity but also to be confident that our own transition to Socialism will follow a course that permits the maintenance at all stages of a pretty high degree of civil liberty.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CHECKING THE SCALES OF JUSTICE

JOHN ELTON

IN recent years many people who were not guilty of any crime, or whose guilt was never satisfactorily proved, have been sent to prison and some have been executed. Such miscarriages of justice have been reported in many countries. In the U.S.A. the persecution of the Rosenbergs and Sobell, in England the Evans case and more recently the three men convicted of armed attack on a policeman; in the British and French colonies a fair number of cases (including in particular the 'collective punishment' of many thousands of innocent people). Recently the authorities in the Soviet Union and in the People's Democracies have announced that grave and widespread miscarriages of justice have occurred in their countries, resulting in the death or imprisonment of many innocent people.

This problem was frankly discussed by the International Association of Democratic Lawyers at its Sixth Congress in May of this year. Over 170 lawyers from 32 countries met in Brussels to celebrate the tenth anniversary of the founding of the Association. Together with advocates and professors from most of the countries of the west, there were big and important delegations from Japan, China, India, Vietnam, the Soviet Union, Brazil, Chile, the Argentine, the Middle East and other countries.

From the point of view of its law, the world is divided not only along the familiar political lines, but by systems of jurisprudence going back many centuries: the Anglo-Saxon, the Continental, the Hindu and so on. Yet the surprizing feature of the Brussels Conference was the extent of agreement on the basic principles necessary to safeguard the rights of accused persons in criminal trials.

The Conference adopted as a basis for its discussions on this subject the report of Mr. Dudley Collard, an English barrister and foundation member of the Haldane Society, who postulated four fundamental requirements for any system of criminal procedure:

(*a*) that it should be reasonably speedy;

(*b*) that it should apply to all citizens without discrimination;

(*c*) that it should make as few mistakes as possible;

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*d*) that there should be ample opportunity for correcting mistakes made.

Among those taking an active part in the debate on this subject were Mr. P. Koudriatsev, a Vice-Minister of Justice of the U.S.S.R., and Professor S. A. Golunsky of the Soviet Procurator's department (whose recent visit to England deeply impressed our legal profession). They dealt with the abuses of power by security police and the overriding of the rule of law which took place in the U.S.S.R. from 1934 to 1953. Similarly the Polish and Bulgarian delegates gave an account of abuses of power and violations of legality in their countries and the steps which have been taken to put things right.

After two days of intensive study in commission, the Conference unanimously endorsed the following 'minimum code' for the protection of the citizen accused of a criminal offence:

1. *Nullum Crimen Sine Lege* (*No crime without a law expressly creating the offence*).

We have observed with regret many infringements of this principle in which we re-affirm our belief. We consider that the doctrine of analogy ought not to form part of any procedure and that offences should be clearly stated. In particular, we reject the conception of collective punishment.

2. *The need for the accused to be brought to trial speedily.*

The period from time of arrest to appearance before a Magistrate, or judicial functionary should not exceed 48 hours. To ensure this there must be effective legal sanctions, civil or criminal and unjustified detention should give rise to an action for damages. During the preliminary investigation the accused should not be kept in detention more than three months without the permission of the Court after an open hearing of the parties.

3. *Fair Trial.*

(*a*) It is desirable that Courts of first instance should contain a lay element appointed on democratic principles.

(*b*) No punishment involving deprivation of liberty should be imposed except by a judicial tribunal.

4. *No discrimination against an accused.*

There should be no discrimination in the forms of penal procedure or punishment for reason of race, religion, class or any other cause. This point arises because in some legal systems, particularly in colonial countries, sections of the population are tried by a procedure which provides less guarantees than those afforded by the procedure to which other members of the population are subject.

5. *Rights of Defence.*

(*a*) An accused without means should be entitled to effective legal aid and representation by a qualified lawyer before all tribunals without exception.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Rembrandt and Saskia (1636)

THIS year marks the 350th Anniversary of the birth of Rembrandt, one of the greatest artists the world has ever seen.

To celebrate the occasion, *Labour Monthly* has reproduced these examples of his etching and drawing which reveal the penetrating psychological insight and the deep humanity to be found in all Rembrandt's work.

Portrait of Clement

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EMBRANDT

1606-1669

he (1651)

Seated Beggar (1630)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*b*) The accused and his counsel should have the same rights at the hearing as has the prosecution.

(*c*) From the moment of arrest every accused should have the right to consult with his legal advisers without surveillance.

(*d*) In countries where the preliminary investigation is in private, defending counsel should be entitled to be present with the accused at all stages of the preliminary investigation and to have access to the prosecution dossier before the examination or confrontation.

6. *Proof.*

(*a*) A confession particularly one made to the police should be corroborated before it can be the basis of a conviction. The evidence of an accomplice must be corroborated by independent evidence.

(*b*) Conviction should be based only on facts proved in evidence.

(*c*) No arrested person should be subject to any physical pressure, threats or promises calculated to produce a statement.

7. *Appeal.*

There should be at least one appeal in all criminal proceedings.

8. *Punishment.*

(*a*) Corporal punishment should be abolished.

(*b*) The death penalty should be abolished in time of peace.

9. *State of Emergency.*

No state of emergency abrogating these principles should be permitted in time of peace.

We consider that one of the strongest guarantees of the application of these principles is to assure full and fair publicity for all criminal proceedings with the exception of those involving state secrets or matters of serious indecency. We put forward these proposals as minimum suggestions only in the belief that their adoption would involve significant advances in nearly every criminal procedure throughout the world. We urge all lawyers to do whatever they can to secure their implementation in their own countries.

The important features for us to note are the proposals for the abolition of the death penalty in peacetime (for all offences, *i.e.*, for treason and murder and not merely for murder, as proposed in the Silverman Bill), the need for every confession to be corroborated and the abolition of collective punishment. These proposals will require changes in the English law and in Emergency Legislation in the Colonies. Indeed, those participating in the conference from all countries have a long campaign ahead of them before their Minimum Code becomes law.

The remainder of the work of the Congress was devoted to international law, both public and private. For the development of civilised relations between states in the future, the settlement of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

international legal problems can play a useful part in making a reality of peaceful co-existence.

Professor Manfred Lachs (of Warsaw University and Chairman of the Law Commission of U.N.O.) read a paper to the conference on 'The United Nations Charter as a Legal Basis for Peaceful Co-existence', in which he stressed that the Charter, and in particular the unanimity principle had been devised specifically to assure equality of rights between nations and to prevent the domination of U.N.O. by one group of nations. Attempts to revise the Charter and in particular to undermine the unanimity principle could only injure relations between states. Peaceful co-existence by definition precludes attempts at 'majority' rule in the Security Council and demands the preservation of the unanimity principle.

Other topics discussed were the position of state enterprises in international trade, the legal problems arising from the nationalisation of concerns with foreign capital investments and the question of international payments. Much research work has been done by lawyers in the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies on these subjects, and important papers were read by Mr. Boura (Dean of the Faculty of Law of Charles University, Prague), Professor Lountz of the Soviet Institute of Juridical Science, Professor Vassilov of Sofia University and Dr. Wiemann of the Humboldt University, Berlin.

In conclusion it may, I think, be fairly said that the Conference, representing even within the national delegations such varied points of view, showed a practical effort on the part of the progressive lawyers of the world to work together honestly and courageously towards a solution of some of the real problems facing mankind today.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BRITAIN'S SHAME IN CYPRUS

R. PAGE ARNOT

WHEN Shakespeare in one of his most famous plays told how the Cyprus situation had become so urgent that it was necessary to replace the civilian governor by the great military chief, and to send troops there in great numbers, and even stressed 'the importancy of Cyprus to the Turk', no one could have imagined that this background would be repeated three-and-a-half centuries later, with Field Marshal Sir John Harding taking the place of the civilian governor and with the Turks brought in as a threat; but that instead of a domestic tragedy there would be the drama of a national struggle, with all the apparatus of repression enforced by a Tory government whose actions have brought the name of Britain into disrepute throughout the world.

Month after month of this year and last year this has been going on, and getting from bad to worse. All the repeated claims with each new act of repression that 'law and order' would soon be established have been disproved by events. They claimed that the deportation of Archbishop Makarios would put an end to 'terrorism'. It has not had this effect. All the howling of the millionaire-owned newspapers to drown the voices of protest within Britain cannot suppress the growing demand within Britain for the ending of this sorry business.

Think what is happening. In the second week of June under the significant headline 'Big Operation in Cyprus' a despatch from the island begins:

> All traffic was banned today in the west Cyprus mountains, where 5,000 British troops are searching for the terrorist leader Dighenis and his subordinates. (*The Times*, June 12, 1956.)

'5,000 British troops' in part of that small island, with the islanders numbering little over half a million, or one-hundredth part of the population of the United Kingdom. To grasp the scale of it, you must think of half-a-million troops engaged in a search operation in the Lake District or some other corner of Britain. Why, the search for 'Bonny Prince Charlie' two centuries ago, with a price on his head, was conducted by 'The Butcher', the Duke of Cumberland, with fewer troops in proportion. It was one of the charges against 'The Butcher' that a price was put on the head of the fugitive: for this used to be considered barbarous. It was the mark

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of a semi-civilised government. The despatch from Cyprus goes on:

> Dighenis—believed to be George Grivas, a former officer in the Greek Army—has a price of £10,000 on his head.

If every record of these days were wiped out leaving only this single column of *The Times* newspaper, what an atrocious age this would then appear to be: and how future historians would ponder over the similarity to earlier actions in the Empires of Assyria and Rome. One sentence more, from this same despatch, runs as follows:

> A British service man was accidentally shot dead today when he walked into an ambush laid for terrorists in south-west Cyprus.

What sort of set-up is this? It is no use telling his next-of-kin that these things are all part of the day's work; or claiming, as they used to do in 'colonial wars', that such methods must be used against savages. For the people of Cyprus are far from being savages. Cyprus is one of the cradles of civilisation. They were speaking Greek in that island, aye, and writing Greek and reading Greek two thousand years before any but the merest handful of Englishmen could read or write their own language—as candidly stated by Alfred the Great about the barbarous people of whom he was king.

The Greeks of Cyprus, like so many others, have fallen often enough under alien governors: but while they have little reason to regret the Turks from whom Disraeli's Tory Government took over the island (together with a Turkish minority, the deposit of three centuries of Ottoman rule) as 'secret commission' for backing Abdul the Damned in a Concert of Europe conference ('Baksheesh!' it was called in the Levant, as is recorded by Scawen Blunt who felt keenly the shame of it), nevertheless they must now share the modern world outlook where one after another peoples previously subject to the Ottoman Empire have acquired and vindicated full rights of nationality, freed from both Turk and Western European.

These Cypriots have been oppressed beyond even their neighbours. British newspapers and politicians for this last quarter of a century have managed to keep an almost unbroken silence about the fact that ever since 1931 when the corrupt J. H. Thomas was Colonial Secretary, this crown colony, deprived of previously-existing small rights, has been governed despotically. Cypriots in Britain, like most other 'British subjects', have full rights as citizens. Back in their own island, even before this last fifteen months, they have been for the last 25 years under an irresponsible despotism, lorded over by officials, taxed without representation and able only in the case of the large towns to elect their mayors. And these

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mayors, elected with the backing of AKEL and the trade unions, are now in prison, 'detained', not charged with any offence—except the offence of being almost the sole elected representatives of the townspeople. But now, after these many months—to quote the mild language of the Secretary of the Ethnarchy Council in Cyprus on his arrival in London on June 12—'collective punishments, deportations, detention camps, evictions of citizens from their shops and homes, imprisonments, executions and various other repressive measures complicate the problem instead of solving it'.

This is coming to be recognised in some of the more sober British newspapers, as witness the *Manchester Guardian's* dismay:

> What will the Government do next to hurt Britain's reputation? Now it has deported a priest simply because he was chairman of a fund which, by its own account, was intended to help the families of people detained in Cyprus under the emergency regulations. . . .
>
> The British authorities will appear—perhaps justly—as intent on suppressing a humanitarian measure. They will seem devoid of compassion and determined on vindictiveness. Is this really cause for proud cheering from the Conservative back benches? The display in the House yesterday, if reported widely abroad, will deepen the repugnance towards British conduct over Cyprus. (June 14, 1956.)

It was the *Daily Worker*, however, which so far has been the only newspaper to draw the obvious conclusion with its call 'Stop this bloodshed in Cyprus' and its Peace Plan, published on June 2, which demanded: no more hanging of Cypriots, no more collective punishment, no more use of Turkish Cypriot police against Greek Cypriots, release of Makarios and all political detainees. These were immediate measures, to be followed by

> Recognition of the unconditional right of self-determination.
>
> End to the Emergency Regulations and an amnesty for all sentenced under them.
>
> A round-table conference of all Cypriot parties to draw up a plan for self-determination and to form a coalition Government to which Britain can transfer power.
>
> Recall of the troops. The Cypriot Government to hold a general election for an Assembly to decide the island's future.

This peace plan is bound to find a response in the Labour movement where there is already a strong feeling against the Tory repression in Cyprus, a feeling notably voiced by Mr. Aneurin Bevan at his Newcastle meeting when he said:

> The Tories suddenly became bloody-minded. Because they have just evacuated the Canal Zone and were so angry and irritable at waking up

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the fact that they were in the twentieth century, they have decided to be tough in Cyprus and our boys are now paying the price for it.

(*Manchester Guardian*, May 28, 1956.)

This speech, when his leader Hugh Gaitskell followed him a few days later to a similar effect, means that the lead given by Mr. Kenneth Robinson in his speech in the Cyprus debate of March 14 has now been officially adopted by the Labour Party chiefs, and may now be expressed by official opposition in Parliament. But the Bevan speech, although emphatic enough in one respect (in its laying of blame upon the Tories) is still incomplete as a statement of policy so long as (in the same speech) he takes a stand for retaining British troops in Cyprus. This further stage, inevitable if the logic of opposition to Tory repression is to be followed through, has still to be reached by the official leadership of the Labour Party.

The temper of trade unionists has been rising as the millionaires through their press have been slandering trade unions both for their standpoint on Cyprus and for their resistance to the government's effort to force down the standard of living in Britain. A strong answer and a clear policy was given, ten days after Bevan's speech, by Abe Moffat at the Scottish Miners' Conference:

This union has gone on record for the withdrawal of British troops from Cyprus. . . .

We will continue to demand this in order to save the lives of British people and the lives of the people of the Colonial countries.

Between this complete policy and the as yet incomplete statements of the Labour front bench there is a clear difference. The difference can disappear if the feeling among trade unionists and the Labour movement generally is sufficiently strongly voiced. But if the difference remains, it plays into the hands of the Tories who will take full advantage of it. On the other hand, victory for a thoroughgoing Labour policy on Cyprus would be a serious set-back for the millionaires, for their newspapers and for their Tory government.

The Combination Acts of a century and a half ago not only outlawed trade unionism but made it a crime to gather money for the defence of those accused of being trade unionists. Baldwin thirty years ago showed himself the vilest creature that was ever Prime Minister when he called to the people of North America not to send help to the starving families of the British miners. The Beaverbrook press went one worse than these, lower than Baldwin, when the millionaire newspaper the *Daily Express* launched its attack against the Electrical Trades Union's Executive for having sent £20 to the Cyprus Emergency Fund (the fund for legal aid to men kept in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gaols in Cyprus with no crimes laid to their charge) and tried for a ballot of their vast readership to back up their attack. It was a challenge not so much to the E.T.U. as to the whole trade union movement; for, as was rightly said in the *Daily Herald* of June 13:

> Every trade union branch, every Labour Party should send a donation to the Cyprus Emergency Fund.

This loudly-trumpeted ballot brought in ·05 per cent. of the *Daily Express* readers—a result which only the present Home Secretary could lap up, like a dog that eats dirty puddings.

What a government! What a press!
What shame they bring upon Britain.

CURIOUS BUT FAMILIAR

SANCHO PANZA

SOCIALISM AND SOCIALIST IDEALS

> There is no argument nowadays about the Labour Party being socialist: on the contrary, some more or less friendly competition proceeds as to who are the best and most effective socialists.—*Herbert Morrison.*

TO be a socialist in the Labour Party does not necessarily mean approval of socialism, though it invariably means approval of socialist ideals. The socialists in the Labour Party can be therefore roughly divided into two categories—those who want to achieve socialist ideals through Socialism and those who want to achieve socialist ideals without socialism, in some other way. To the second category belong some of the older 'realistic' leaders and most of the younger, more modern, more 'dynamic', more 'responsible' and more 'idealistic' leaders like Mr. Gaitskell and those university dons and such like who have not yet arrived. This combination of old 'realism' and modern 'idealism' is very curious.

The first category want to abolish the causes of social inequality, unequal opportunities and other social abuses. They argue that it is necessary to get rid of capitalism, to deprive the private owners of big industries and enterprises of their power over the work and lives of other people and to establish common ownership. They argue that these measures are more urgent in the modern era because of the tremendous concentration of power in a few hands.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The second category argue that in the modern era of automation, electronics, atomic energy, full employment, Welfare State, etc., it is absurd to call our present economy capitalist. The leopard has changed its spots. Anti-capitalist socialism, it is said, is out-dated. 'Economic issues will be of less and less interest to socialists' (Crosland). Only social and ethical ideals are supposed to matter. It is also said that the young people of today are idealistic and do not want to be bothered with material considerations. Unfortunately, says Mr. Crosland:

> The mental adjustment to the new state of affairs meets a deep-seated psychological resistance. The active militants feel their whole status and purpose in life to depend on preserving a traditional, class-conscious, anti-capitalism.

There is the rub. The majority of the membership seem to stick to socialism and anti-capitalism regardless of being called names like 'old-fashioned', users of 'stale slogans' and 'shibboleths'. Who wants to be old-fashioned?

There are many words in the vocabulary of the Labour movement which seem to give a lot of trouble to the leadership. The word 'socialism', for instance, which was too much used during the Labour Government and much taken in vain, has become most embarrassing in relation to the 'jolly old electorate and what it will swallow' (Morrison) and in relation to the rôle of the Party as Her Majesty's Opposition. So have some other words used in connection with socialism like 'nationalisation'. In a speech to some like-minded people Mr. Gaitskell explained:

> There is a terrorism of words not so very different from the physical terrorism associated with totalitarian régimes. We can be terrorised by words and we can be terrorised, so to speak, into not thinking properly.

He has decided not to succumb to the 'terrorism of words', but to deal severely with the offending words. As the word 'socialism' cannot be altogether abandoned out of consideration for the membership, it can be redefined so as not to cause offence to anybody. The word must be kept strictly inside the Party, and well hidden from the electorate, so that no whisper can reach their ears. The modern policy makers have had little or no contact with the working people and their aspirations both inside and outside the Party, although they think they know all about them. They resent some words liked and used by the workers like 'solidarity' and 'unity' which seem to them entirely meaningless in the modern era—or even dangerous.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On the other hand, the membership will be free to 'sell' (the word is used in the pamphlet on 'Political Education') socialist ideals when these have been thoroughly clarified and overhauled and when a suitable sales-talk has been properly mastered in the current idiom of the capitalist press. The modern leaders seem to have grown more and more like go-ahead businessmen who always look for new lines to sell. As, according to Mr. Gaitskell, 'the social barriers have already crumbled and the old inequalities greatly diminished', the modern socialist ideals are very modest—a little more of something, a little less of another thing: a little more equality, a little better education, a little better status for the worker, a little less class privilege, a little less snobbery, a little less ostentatious expenditure by high Society. As the Tory Party has pinched a good many of the new and modern socialist ideals and ideas, the leadership of the Labour Party is put on its mettle to show that there are differences between the ideals and ideas of the Tories and their own. They have also decided to refute the taunt of the Tories that they have lost the 'battle of slickness', that they have 'run out of ideas' and have 'exhausted their capacity for creative thinking'. Both parties, in a friendly competition with each other, are looking over their shoulders at the advance made in the Soviet Union.

To solve the formidable dilemma facing the leadership of the Labour Party, the leaders are supposed to have retired to do some thinking. We do not know yet the result, but we know the principles guiding the thinking:

> There must be in the leadership both enough dynamic to rouse and sustain the enthusiasm of active Party workers and enough good practical commonsense to win the confidence of the electorate.—(Gaitskell.)

I note that the practical commonsense is reserved for the electorate and the dynamic for the Party worker.

FIRST FRUITS

> Better ORGANISATION, effective yet responsible OPPOSITION in Parliament—we want these. But, of course, there is POLICY too.—*Gaitskell, Daily Herald,* 15.2.56.

Disquiet has been expressed in the Labour Party over the delay in formulating policy. May I assure these friends that there is no need to worry. Besides, as Mr. Morrison said, 'to give the impression that the party was without a policy or philosophy is slanderous'. The policy for the Party and the 'fundamentals of its faith' have been decided by Mr. Gaitskell and his friends long ago. The feat of combining 'realism', 'idealism', 'responsibility' and 'butskellism'

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as the basis of the New Democratic Socialism has been accomplished. I apologise for the use of the term 'butskellism', which may sound out-of-date, but this word, in want of a better, has come to stay as an expression of a new British political doctrine. Mr. Gaitskell has had no need to retire for a quiet contemplation to know where exactly he desires the Party to go. He has been thinking aloud a good while now.

The purpose of the retirement of the leaders for thinking is a quite different one. Ways and means have to be found to give Mr. Gaitskell's policy and philosophy an official stamp and to 'sell' to the Party the new ideas and ideals and to cure the members from the illusions of socialism. All this needs quite a lot of thinking and production of printed matter. A good deal of thinking is also needed to find some differences from the Tory ideals and ideas for the benefit of the electorate. I understand that the problem of 'equality' is going to be 'the crux of the British political battle today' (*The Times*). The battle then is intended to be mainly psychological.

> We can probably dispense with the economists now—it is sociologists that the Party needs

says Mr. Crosland. He seems to have been too shy to mention the greater need of psychologists. This idea as many other ideas of the modern socialists is largely derived from America where psychology has become the driving power in economic, social and political problems. Not to mention 'psychological warfare' as one of the most important parts of foreign and military policies. In general, psychology has become the accepted means to bring to heel the American people who might rebel against the reign of big business.

The first fruits of the new thinking has reached the membership in the shape of a drive for an improved election machine and a machine for political education. They are to be welcomed, especially the latter, as the Labour Party has seriously suffered from lack of political education. But it seems to me that the cart has been put before the horse. The main aim of political education as stated in the pamphlet on 'Political Education' is to enable members 'to sell to the electorate a policy which fits the modern world' in order to regain power. But the pamphlet does not throw light on the subject. If I am to be cured of my socialist illusions, I would like to know how this is going to be done. For the time being members are left to find their own way.

> There will be no dictation from above, no attempt to tell people what to think or even what to discuss.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Which is a very good thing and I hope members will take advantage of it. But the leadership threatens to give 'special attention' to political education, to 'provide material' for discussion and to 'inform the local Parties of new ideas'—which is not so good.

The new policy of the Labour Party is said to be 'vigorous', 'dynamic', 'fullblooded', 'fighting', 'virile', 'militant' and 'positive'. All we know for certain about it is that the leadership has rejected socialist measures and holds out no hope for a speedy achievement of socialist ideals. But we must not be impatient. Lord Attlee has warned us:

> We have an *infinitely* long way to go. . . . Socialist society is always coming on all the time; we reach one point—and go on to the next.

Or as Mr. Gaitskell puts it:

> The truth is that a democratic socialist must recognise that *for a long time to come* we shall live in a mixed economy.

These statements do not seem to me very inspiring. Nevertheless, they are expected to create the necessary 'fervour and enthusiasm' of active members to work for a Labour Government.

> The Gaitskell bandwagon is now as overloaded as a Cairo tram, and in the din of the drummers and the oaths of changing allegiance it is hard to hear the small voice of the Party which is always there despite the tumult.
> (Maurice Edelman, *New Statesman and Nation*, December 17, 1955.)

At a future date, if the editors allow me, I shall endeavour to examine 'what socialism is now about' (Crosland) and what 'equality' means in the modern era.

CONTENTS OF PREVIOUS NUMBERS—1956

FEBRUARY: *Leadership and Policy in Britain* (R.P.D.); *Cyprus, Greece and N.A.T.O.* (T. Doganis); *Light on Israeli Policy* (S. Mikunis); *Youth Under the Microscope* (P. Allen); *Western Values, II* (Sancho Panza); *The Mantle of McCarthy* (C. Meredith); *Nkrumah and Gold Coast* (I. Cox). BOOK REVIEWS: *Five Hundred Years of Printing* (S. H. Steinberg); *Bees* (I. Khalifman); reviewed by A. Tuckett, I. Montagu. COMMUNICATION: *'Constructive Imperialism'* (B. Davidson).

MARCH: *Crisis and Contrast* (R. Page Arnot); *How to Fight the Tory Offensive* (John Gollan); *Does Labour Deserve Gaitskell?* (James Klugmann); *What Now in France?* (Peter Fryer); *Homes for the People—or Means Test?* (T. Balmer); *The Great Pioneer* (Andrew Rothstein); *The Paris Commune: Marx Family Letters; They Remembered the Commune* (Angela Tuckett).

APRIL: *The Vision Splendid* (R.P.D.); *British Labour and the Soviet Union* (Fred Henderson); *Tom Mann Centenary* (Harry Pollitt); *Engineering* (J. R. Scott); *N.A.T.O.—Fact and Fiction* (Sancho Panza). BOOK REVIEWS: *Peter the First* (A. Tolstoy); *Mozart's Letters* (E. Blom); *Opera in Czechoslovakia* (L. Sip); *The Secret Diary of Harold Ickes; I Speak My Own Piece* (E. G. Flynn); *Labour's Way Forward* (T. Braddock and J. Lawrence); reviewed by C. Hill, W. Paul, D. N. Pritt, Q.C., I. Brown, B.M.B.

MAY: *The Great Debate* (R.P.D.); *We Choose Friendship* (Judith Todd); *The General Strike, 1926* (R. Page Arnot); *After the Communist Congress* (John Gollan); *One of the Mammoths* (J. Carter); *Historical Materialism and the Ancient World* (Joseph Needham, F.R.S.). BOOK REVIEWS: *Those Stormy Years* (George Hardy); *Bryn Roberts and the National Union of Public Employees* (W. W. Craik); *Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Vol. IV; Against the Law* (P. Wildeblood); *Christianity and Communism* (Society of Friends); *What are these Soviet Trade Unions?* (British-Soviet Friendship Society); reviewed by Wm. Gallacher, Gordon Schaffer, B. Farrington, D. N. Pritt, Q.C., S. Evans, T. McW.

JUNE: *New Times, New Measures* (R.P.D.); *After the Visit* (Quæstor); *No Automation without Consultation* (R. Birch); *The Devil's Dilemma* (Ivor Montagu); *Constructive Co-existence* (Economista). BOOK REVIEWS: *The Karlsruhe Trial* (Trans. C. P. Dutt); *Looking at China* (Paul Hogarth); reviewed by D. N. Pritt, Q.C., R.T.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ENGLISH REVOLUTION 1640

V. LAVROVSKY and M. BARG

[*Through the kindness of Academician E. A. Kosminsky, the authors readily consented to write this review article on a subject whose abiding interest extends far beyond England. Professor Lavrovsky is well known for his* Parliamentary Enclosures of Commons in Britain in the Late 18th and Early 19th Centuries. *Professor Barg has written a study* The Development of the English Feudal Village in the 11th and 13th Centuries.—*Ed., L.M.*]

MR. CHRISTOPHER HILL'S *The English Revolution 1640*,* which in 1955 came out in its third edition (first edition, 1940), is well known in Great Britain and beyond its borders. In view of the deserved attention this work enjoys among a wide circle of British and Soviet readers, it is well to note both the new interpretation of the 1640 Revolution, which ensured the success of the preceding editions, and the further development of the author's views, reflected in some important passages in the third edition, essentially differing from those in the previous ones. The changes made by the author for the third edition are a result of the discussions among British Marxist historians following the publication of the first edition of Hill's book—in 1940 and 1941, and later in 1946, 1947 and 1948.

From the very outset one notes the amendments and amplifications made by the author in the Introduction. While in the previous editions he said that as a result of the Revolution 'an old order that was essentially feudal was destroyed by violence, a new and capitalist social order created in its place' (1st ed., p. 9) in the third edition we find this significant amplification: 'power passed into the hands of a new class. . . . The Civil War was a class war. . . .' (3rd ed., p. 6). As a result of the victory won by Parliament in the Civil War, in which broad masses of the population took part, power passed into the hands of the bourgeoisie and the new progressive gentry. And it is this precisely that made possible the freer and more rapid development of capitalism in the century following the Revolution. This correction was made necessary by the misconceptions and contradictions which arose around this question in the discussions. Reviewer P.F. expressed the paradoxical view that the 'bourgeois revolution' had allegedly taken place in England back

*Lawrence & Wishart, 3s. 6d.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at the time of the Tudors, long before 1640: that in the sixteenth century, England was already 'definitely bourgeois, that is, capitalist'. Unlike the reviewer, Hill had quite correctly pointed out that pre-revolutionary England, and especially the English countryside in the sixteenth century, was 'essentially feudal'. However, both in the first and third editions of his book, Hill rather exaggerates, in our opinion, the degree of capitalist industrial development in England in the century preceding the bourgeois revolution of the 1640's. In the first edition he, in fact, agrees with Nef when he says that 'an industrial revolution took place in the century before 1640' (1st ed., p. 30). True, in the third edition he more cautiously formulates this point: he writes that only 'something like an industrial revolution took place in the century before 1640' (3rd ed., p. 22).

We cannot, however, agree with this new formulation because the industrial revolution 'in the strictest sense of this important term' (*Cf.* Marx, *Capital,* vol. I, Chapter XV, Section I) took place in England only in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, *i.e.*, nearly two centuries after the revolution of the seventeenth century, and not in the century preceding the revolution. The bourgeois revolution of the seventeenth century destroyed feudal relations of production, promoted the establishment of capitalist relations of production and the rapid growth of capitalism in the two centuries following it. That is why Soviet historians cannot agree with the view of G. Unwin, H. L. Beales, J. U. Nef and other representatives of this trend in the historiography of the industrial revolution, who attempt to reverse this important Marxist postulate and replace it by the concept that the English Revolution was supposedly a long, gradual evolution. The discussion in 1947-48, a highly fruitful one held on the occasion of the tercentenary of the English Republic (Commonwealth, 1649), took up also the nature of absolutism under the Tudors and the first Stuarts. It should be noted that the question of the historical rôle of absolutism is one of the important problems of Marxist-Leninist investigation in the bourgeois revolution of the 1640's and the Marxist theory of the state.

Opposing the theory of the 'supra-class' character of the Tudor monarchy, Hill gives a very clear characteristic of the class forces and their correlation under the Tudors and Stuarts. The Tudor monarchy which was rooted in feudal society could, according to Hill, balance between the bourgeoisie and progressive gentry, on the one hand, and the feudal lords on the other. The function of the monarchy, in his opinion, was to ensure that the inevitable accept-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ance of the bourgeoisie's demands should cause the ruling class the least possible harm (pp. 27-28). The Stuart monarchy grows less and less useful to the bourgeoisie and more and more necessary to the feudal aristocracy and courtiers, becoming their only guarantee of economic survival. That is why the feudalists so desperately fought for the monarchy in the Civil War (p. 29).

If in the early sixteenth century the monarchy had used the bourgeoisie as an ally against its rivals—the great feudal houses—and on this ground there was the possibility of an alliance between the Crown and Parliament; in the early decades of the seventeenth century, with the increasing economic difficulties and the political threat of the bourgeoisie, the monarchy was thrown back on the exclusive support of the feudal nobility and the economically unprogressive, parasitic elements in the state (p. 31). Hence, the mounting conflict, and denunciation of the court 'drones', in which the Puritan sermons abounded. Hill vividly portrays the two social systems and the contending ideologies (p. 32).

The political, religious, economic and constitutional struggle under James I led to an open breach under Charles I. It is noteworthy that while in the first edition Hill says that in 1640, 'all classes' were united against the Crown (1st ed., p. 54), he formulates this more cautiously in the third edition: 'most classes' (3rd ed., p. 40), which is more correct. The Grand Remonstrance disclosed an irreconcilable division in Parliament itself, and the decision to print it occasioned a savage clash in the House of Commons.

Defining the class basis of Charles I's policy, Hill writes: 'His Government tried to perpetuate a feudal social order when the conditions existed for free capitalist development, when the increase of national wealth could only come by means of free capitalist development' (1st ed., pp. 56-57). 'England in 1640 was still economically a feudal state, though with this vast and expanding capitalist sector' (1st ed., p. 36). In the third edition this formulation has been changed: 'England in 1640 was still ruled by landlords and the relations of production were still partly feudal, but there was this vast and expanding capitalist sector' (3rd ed., p. 26). In these 'slight changes' in the third edition one feels the quite serious and fruitful results of the scientific controversy and struggle of opinions in the discussion of Hill's book.

A victory for Charles I in the Civil War could, in Hill's opinion, only have meant the economic stagnation of England, the stabilisation of a backward feudal society and an inevitable even bloodier

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

struggle later. With the victory over Charles I the old State system was destroyed—partially, it is true—and a new one was being built up under the pressure of events. 'The war was being made a people's war' (1st ed., p. 63).

We cannot understand why this important formulation has been omitted in the third edition (p. 47) and the victory in the Civil War is explained not by the fact that the war became a people's war but . . . only that in the military sense the war was won by artillery and Cromwell's yeomen cavalry (p. 47). The events at Putney and the activities of the Army Council are described by Hill only cursorily (1st ed., p. 64-66, 3rd ed., p. 48-50).

Explaining the causes of the Levellers' failure, Hill rightly points out that the Levellers expressed the demands of the petty bourgeoisie, a class always unstable and depending on the big bourgeoisie. Moreover, the petty bourgeoisie in the seventeenth century was in the process of stratification. Many of the most successful and influential members of the petty bourgeoisie found that they had interests in common with those of the bourgeoisie, like the kulaks in the Russian Revolution. Thus Hill has posed a very important and unexplored question of the differentiation of the English peasantry in the 1640's. While some of the richer yeomen and artisans were prospering and pushing their way into the bourgeoisie and gentry, many more were being squeezed down to the status of landless agricultural labourers (3rd ed., pp. 50-51). The events of the Civil War undoubtedly speeded up this process. What, however, were the concrete results of the differentiation of the English peasantry in the 1630's-40's? This important question needs further investigation and with statistical analysis of manorial surveys and rentals.

Noting that there was no organised working-class movement and a scientific revolutionary theory in England of the 1640's, Hill points out the fatal consequences of this fact for the bourgeois-democratic task of the revolution. He also holds that the nearest the English bourgeois revolution got to an independent proletarian movement was the Digger movement, which he regards as an attempt to proceed by direct action to a form of agrarian communism. He considers the teaching of Winstanley to be an anticipation of historical materialism and scientific communism (1st ed., p. 69).

We are glad to note that this characterisation of Winstanley has been omitted in the third edition where Winstanley's communist ideal is described as backward-looking, since it arose from the village community which capitalism was already disintegrating—a charac-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

terisation historically more correct. Hill, however, is unquestionably right in characterising the Diggers as the most radical and most egalitarian opponents of the feudal social order (3rd ed., p. 52).

The history of the English republic and Cromwell's protectorate is given by Hill in the form of a number of brief summary theses, but not in the form of an extended exposition of the basic problems of historical development of this period. In the conclusion of his essay Hill has outlined some of the further problems of Marxist research in the post-Revolutionary period: the destruction of a whole social order, feudalism and the introduction of a political structure within which capitalism could freely develop (1st ed., p. 80; 3rd ed., p. 61). A number of problems pertaining to this question both in the sphere of economic history and in the sphere of the history of ideas remain entirely uninvestigated. The revolutions in industrial and agricultural technique which were to change the face of England in the eighteenth century, Hill writes, would have been impossible without the political revolution of the seventeenth century (3rd ed., pp. 59-60). We do not see why Hill in this case calls the seventeenth-century revolution a 'political' one. But he is right that the agrarian and industrial revolutions of the seventeenth century would have been impossible without the bourgeois revolution of the 1640's (*Cf.* 1st ed., p. 29; 3rd ed., p. 21). There was no large-scale revolution in agricultural technique until the eighteenth century, though its beginnings can be traced back to the revolutionary decades of the seventeenth century (3rd ed., p. 21). A real revolution in agricultural technique took place only in the period of the wars with revolutionary and Napoleonic France.

Lastly, as regards the history of ideas, the development of scientific thought, the world outlook and philosophy of English Enlightenment in the late seventeenth and in the eighteenth centuries, Hill is absolutely right that the question of the enormous influence of the 'freedom of intellectual speculation' in late seventeenth and eighteenth-century England on the ideas of French Enlightenment and the French Revolution remains almost entirely unexplored both in his short essay and in the Soviet two-volume investigation, *The English Revolution of the 17th Century,* Ed., E. A. Kosminsky and Y. A. Levitsky, Moscow, 1954, as he observes in his review of the latter work in *Voprosy Istorii,* No. 8, 1955, pp. 187-194.

And so, if in this third edition Hill has not revised and expanded his essay, the need of which is so well evident to himself, he has doubtlessly taken the first step in that direction. and we are glad to note that this step is on the right path.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The scientific significance of Mr. Hill's summary essay is all the greater since Clarendon's present admirers try to prove that the term 'Great Rebellion', expresses more exactly the essence of the events in seventeenth-century England than Gardiner's 'Puritan Revolution'. G. Davies* goes back to Clarendon from Gardiner. G. N. Clark†, the author of another book in the Oxford History of England series, holds that the 1689 *coup d'etat* is the merit not of the Whigs but of the Tories to whom England is much indebted for it, and who to this day maintain Jacobite loyalty and fidelity to the House of Stuart.

H. Trevor Roper‡ goes still further in absolutely denying the revolution of the 1640's as a period which has been consigned to oblivion. Polemising with the 'dean' of the English historians, R. H. Tawney, and the 'erudite Marxist', Christopher Hill, he describes the English revolution of the 1640's as *'une rebellion aveugle'* by *'hobereaux de province'*, the backward provincial gentry. This blind rebellion brought to England *'rien de positive'* and delayed the economic development of England as well as its progress in the sphere of ideas. H. Trevor Roper evidently forgot the agrarian and industrial revolutions which followed the bourgeois revolution of the 1640's in the next one and a half or two centuries as he forgot the English Enlightenment and the growth of modern science in the later seventeenth and in the eighteenth centuries, which also in England were the remote but inevitable consequences of the laws of social development.

Christopher Hill in his short and summary essay (though it needs revision and expansion) is much nearer to the scientific conception of the English bourgeois revolution, its origin, nature, immediate results and further consequences, than H. Trevor Roper in his 'new' interpretation of *'une rebellion aveugle'* in England in the 1640's.

---

*G. Davies, *The Early Stuarts, 1603-1660*, 1937.
†G. N. Clark, *Later Stuarts, 1660-1714*, 1934.
‡H. Trevor Roper, *La revolution anglaise de Cromwell, Annales Economiques Societe, Civilisations*, No. 3, 1955.

LABOUR MONTHLY SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *United Kingdom, 12 months, 18s. post free; $3.00 in U.S.A. and Canada ($3.50 if first class mail); elsewhere overseas, 19s. post free.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EFFECTS OF MACHINERY

KARL MARX

[*In 1868, as in 1956, the working class movement was debating the effects of technical progress under capitalism. Then, as now, there were many who argued that such progress would automatically lead to easier working conditions and a higher standard of life for the workers. In opposition to these views Marx stressed that mechanisation would, in the absence of effective resistance, increase overwork, increase unemployment, intensify the sufferings of small masters and heighten the contradiction between the industrially developed and the under-developed parts of the capitalist world. The question came up for discussion in the International Working Men's Association at a time when industrialism was beginning to spread on a sizeable scale from England to the Continent. Marx's speech, which is now for the first time reprinted since it was reported in* The Beehive *of August 1, 1868, was endorsed by the General Council, and became the basis of the policy of the International at its Congress at Brussels in September, 1868. The speech is a masterly compression of some of the leading ideas developed in* Capital *(Vol. 1, Chapter XV), which had appeared in German a year earlier.—Ed., L.M.*]

HE said what strikes us most is that all the consequences which were expected as the inevitable result of the use of machinery have been reversed. Instead of diminishing the hours of labour, the working day was prolonged to sixteen and eighteen hours. Formerly, the normal working day was ten hours; during the last century the hours of labour were increased by laws here as well as on the Continent. The whole of the trade legislation of the last century turns upon compelling the working people by law to work longer hours. It was not until 1833 that the hours of labour for children were limited to twelve. In consequence of overwork, there was no time left whatever for mental culture. They also became physically deteriorated; contagious fevers broke out among them, and this induced a portion of the upper class to take the matter up.

The first Sir Robert Peel was one of the foremost in calling attention to the crying evil, and Robert Owen was the first mill-owner who limited the hours of labour in his factory. The Ten Hours' Bill was the first law which limited the hours of labour to ten and a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

half per day for women and children, but it applied only to certain factories. This was a step of progress, in so far as it afforded more leisure time to the workpeople. With regard to production, the limitation has long since been overtaken. By improved machinery and increased intensity of the labour of individuals there is now more work done in the short day than formerly in the long day. People are again overworked, and it will soon become necessary to limit the working day to eight hours.

Another consequence of the use of machinery was to force women and children into the factory. The woman has thus become an active agent in our social production. Formerly female and children's labour was carried on within the family circle. I do not say that it is wrong that women and children should participate in our social production. I think every child above the age of nine ought to be employed at productive labour a portion of its time, but the way in which they are made to work under existing circumstances is abominable. Another consequence of the use of machinery was, that it entirely changed the relations of the capital of the country. Formerly, there were wealthy employers of labour, and poor labourers who worked with their own tools. They were to a certain extent free agents, who had it in their power effectually to resist their employers. For the modern factory operative, for the women and children, such freedom does not exist, they are slaves of capital.

There was a constant cry for some invention that might render the capitalist independent of the working man; the spinning machine and the power loom has rendered him independent, it has transferred the motive power of production into his hands. By this the power of the capitalist has been immensely increased. The factory lord has become a penal legislator, within his own establishment, inflicting fines at will, frequently for his own aggrandisement. The feudal baron in his dealings with his serfs was bound by traditions and subject to certain definite rules; the factory lord is subject to no controlling agency of any kind.

One of the great results of machinery is organised labour which must bear fruit sooner or later. The influence of machinery upon those with whose labour it enters into competition is directly hostile. Many hand-loom weavers were positively killed by the introduction of the power-loom both here and in India.

We are frequently told that the hardships resulting from machinery are only temporary, but the development of machinery

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is constant, and if it attracts and gives employment to large numbers at one time it constantly throws large numbers out of employment. There is a continual surplus of displaced population, not as the Malthusian asserts a surplus population in relation to the produce of the country, but a surplus whose labour has been superseded by more productive agencies. Employed on land, machinery produces a constantly increasing surplus population whose employment is not fluctuating. This surplus flocks to the towns and exerts a constant pressure, a wage-lowering pressure upon the labour market. The state of the East of London is one of the phenomena it produces. The real consequences are best seen in those branches of labour in which the machine is not employed.

To conclude for the present, machinery leads on one hand to associated organised labour, on the other to the disintegration of all formerly existing social and family relations.

Excerpt from Beatrice Webb's Diaries, (1925)

February 20th.—The brilliant and venomous attack on J.R.M. —*The Diplomacy of Mr. Ramsay MacDonald*—just published in the *Labour Monthly* and now spread broadcast over the whole world—is the most damaging incident since the Zinoviev Letter. The internal evidence points to George Young* as the author, prompted and helped by Josiah Wedgwood. The worst of it is that whether or not the detail of the indictment of his foreign policy is true the characterisation of J.R.M. is what we should have thought accurate twenty years ago! I have not followed the foreign policy—I have not the requisite knowledge—but all the moral and intellectual difficulties laid bare in this pamphlet one knows to be MacDonald's in other episodes of his life.

*George Young denies authorship; there is some suggestion that it is partly C.P.T. [Trevelyan] (Footnote by Beatrice Webb).

(It may be stated that none of these conjectures is correct. It would be inappropriate as yet to divulge the authorship as the author is still living.—Ed., L.M.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

35th ANNIVERSARY *LABOUR MONTHLY*
MESSAGES OF GREETING

From Kommunist, Soviet Union

We heartily congratulate you on the 35th anniversary of your journal, which carries to the masses the great ideas of Marxism-Leninism and fights for the unity of the working class, for the friendship of the peoples of all countries, for peace and socialism. We wish you further successes in this noble cause.

From China Reconstructs

Heartiest congratulations, *Labour Monthly*, on 35th Birthday, and Editor Palme Dutt, under whose continuous guidance it established and maintained splendid record the world over. Editors and staff of *China Reconstructs* (in fifth year publication) wish *Labour Monthly* long life and express great admiration for its long service in spreading international understanding.

From New Age, India

We send you our warm greetings on the occasion of the celebration of your 35th Anniversary. For 35 years the *Labour Monthly*, under Comrade Dutt's brilliant guidance, has provided us with a Marxist-Leninist analysis of current developments throughout the world. Particularly has it helped the anti-imperialists of India and other countries of the British Empire to understand the relation between their own struggle for national freedom and the struggle of the British working class for an end to the rule of monopoly capital in Britain. We, therefore, take this occasion to acknowledge the deep debt of gratitude that we owe the *Labour Monthly*, and particularly its editor, Comrade Dutt. We hope that the *Labour Monthly* and Comrade Dutt will continue to serve the cause which they have been serving for the last 35 years. With warm greeting.

From Mondo Operaio, Italy

On the occasion of the 35th Anniversary of the foundation of your magazine which has made important contributions to the study of the problems of the international working class movement, it gives me great pleasure to convey in the name of the Directors of *Mondo Operaio* our most sincere wishes for your future work.

From La Pensée, France

The Editing Board of *La Pensée* are glad of the opportunity presented by the thirty-fifth anniversary of *Labour Monthly* to send you their heartiest congratulations and friendliest wishes. The progressive intellectual movement in France, in the vanguard of which *La Pensée* has been waging a decisive fight since its foundation in 1939, is well aware of the important contribution of progressive Britain to the common cause of democracy, welfare and peace. *Labour Monthly*, which derives its quality and efficiency from the close and fruitful association of eminent intellectuals and working class, is read here with great attention and highly appreciated. Your lucid approach to both theoretical and practical problems in reference to the future of your own country helps us to form a better understanding of international affairs and to strengthen, on a basis of clarity, the traditional friendship between our two peoples. On the present occasion we should like to address our special congratulations to R. Palme Dutt, under whose guidance *Labour Monthly* has been edited for 35

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

years, and whose name is well known in this country for his valuable contribution in the struggle against reaction, fascism and war.

From Political Affairs, New York

On the memorable occasion of the 35th anniversary of *Labour Monthly* and of its splendid guidance by Comrade R. Palme Dutt, *Political Affairs* extends its warmest congratulations. Throughout its existence *Labour Monthly* has provided inspiration and illumination for all progressive-minded Americans. Its excellence has served as an example for all journals seeking to advance the cause of Peace, Democracy and Socialism.

From National Affairs, Canada

On behalf of the many, many friends of *Labour Monthly* in Canada I send heartiest congratulations and greetings to the wonderful *Labour Monthly* on its 35th Birthday. To editor R. Palme Dutt we extend our fervent thanks and congratulations. His record is indeed unparalleled. For 35 truly historic years he has, through *Labour Monthly*, brought clarity, confidence and a sure sense of direction to the hosts of *Labour Monthly* friends all over the world. We wish him good health and many, many years of fruitful endeavour as one of the outstanding Marxist editors of our times. Comrade Dutt has done much to help bring about the present glorious days when on both sides of the Atlantic, and all over the world, the peoples are confident that peace will be upheld, that there will be no atomic carnage, that friendship among the nations will flourish as mankind surely advances towards the goal of Socialism and Communism. Greetings to the *Labour Monthly* and all associated with that great international institution of Marxism-Leninism on your 35th Birthday from Canada.

From Einheit, Berlin

For the 35 years' existence of your magazine, *Labour Monthly*, we send you heartiest congratulations. May you have further success in your struggle for unity in action of the British working class.

From Weg und Ziel, Austria

With great interest we follow your magazine month by month. It not only keeps us informed about the chief lines of political development in Great Britain, but also enables us to get to know valuable works of British Marxists. We congratulate our brother organ, *Labour Monthly*, on its 35 years of existence, and wish the editorial comrades, particularly your chief editor, Comrade R. P. Dutt, much success in your further work.

From Democratie Nouvelle, France

We are happy to join in the celebration of your 35th anniversary. We have always followed with the greatest interest the courageous struggle carried on in number after number of the *Labour Monthly* for the defence of the interests of the working class and of the British nation, for the spread of scientific socialism, for peace and understanding between peoples. At this historic moment when one can say with Comrade Mikoyan that 'socialism is stronger in the consciousness of mankind than capitalism'; where from this fact 'there open out limitless possibilities for the future of mankind' (Comrade Palme Dutt's phrase in a recent number of your magazine); it is with certainty of seeing this aim realised that we wish you the most brilliant success.

(A number of messages are unavoidably held over.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MORRIS ON SHAW — 70 YEARS AGO

[In celebration of the centenary of Bernard Shaw, born July 26, 1856, who so often wrote in this magazine, we reproduce below the review of his first published book from Commonweal, *July 17, 1886 (the organ of the Socialist League). It was written by William Morris.—Ed., L.M.]*

Cashel Byron's Profession, by George Bernard Shaw. (Modern Press, 13, Paternoster Row.)

A MERE novel bearing on the face of it no controversial opinion, might not seem a suitable subject for review in these columns, but even apart from the author's well-known views and his power as a Socialist lecturer, a Socialist will find much in 'Cashel Byron's Profession' to interest him as a Socialist. Everything that Mr. Shaw writes must bear with it an indictment against our sham society, and it would be harder to find more incisive criticism of its follies than in this book. Perhaps, to a reader not a Socialist, and therefore not in the secret, it would seem to be nothing more serious than a fantastic piece written on pessimistic lines, as all clever modern novels are, and with no further aim in it; but anyone must be forced to admit that it fulfils the first function of a novel by amusing the reader. As in all literary works of art, one is bound to accept its special atmosphere, which doubtless at first might rather confuse the ordinary reader, since the plot, which one has to accept as possible, consists of the development of the love at first sight of a very rich and refined young lady for a prize-fighter. The said heroine is not very much alive, is rather the embodiment of the author's view of life than a real personage; but the hero is most carefully studied and very successful, and every one of the minor characters is highly finished and natural. Indeed, Mr. Shaw gives very good penn'orths in the matter of invention of incident, and is almost reckless in the care which he bestows on his scenes, as witness the sparring-match before the 'African King' in the Agricultural Hall, or the burst of confused excitement on studious solitude after Byron's great fight with Paradise. Mr. Shaw sees his scenes clearly and accurately; indeed more after the manner of a painter than a dramatic writer. This is a quality which is much rarer than is generally supposed in these days of word-painting. It is probably a defect which naturally goes with it that the scenes are, as far as their artistic effect goes, isolated and lacking in the power that accumulation gives: the whole story rather leaves off than comes to an end, also. However, this is a defect which it shares with all novels of this generation that have any pretence to naturalism. As Mr. Shaw is quite successful in establishing his claim to keen observation and vivid representation, one must not quarrel with him for not attaining to what is mostly beyond the aim of a modern novel, but which both Scott and Dickens now and then touched—the unity and completeness of a great drama. Whatever is attempted in 'Cashel Byron' is done conscientiously and artistically.

Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Wembley News, Wembley, Middlesex, Great Britain. Registered for transmission by Magazine Post to Canada, including Newfoundland.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

when moving with the millions. That a *British Midlander* and an *American Middle Western* factory worker should share this common interest in letters appearing in this column with a *New Zealand* market gardener, a *Chinese* teacher, a *Canadian* lumberjack, an *Indian* student and an *Icelandic* journalist (to mention a handful of our correspondents) is of political significance, as well as making one feel good. For it shows in the simplest way that, if it is not yet true that 'mankind is one', there is nothing that can prevent it becoming so. Or, as a Canadian friend puts it, discussing the possibilities now for the first time before this old world: 'It is a challenge by proof of example as to which social order best meets the needs and hopes of mankind. Socialism welcomes the challenge of peaceful competition. Capitalism fears the test. Yet still some people are so inured to thinking in terms of poverty, fear and ignorance that they do not yet catch the vision of what can be beyond it'. The remaining problem, quite simply, is to break the chains of mental bondage 'some people' accept as their deserts.

There is nothing like this sense of 'companionship' of those linked by a common aim for making people conscious of a strength beyond their own, even when it is expressed in what seem only small ways. Nor need anyone be excluded from it, by reason of distance, old age, isolation or even sickness. Take only one example, the companionship arising from readers passing on their copies to others. Some time ago a *Welsh miner* in personal difficulties had to give up his subscription. A *Middlesex* reader eagerly agreed to pass on a copy to him, and now writes: 'We got corresponding over it, and now we are great friends'. A *West Country reader* finding his copy no longer needed by a *retired blacksmith* temporarily in a tough spot, asked us to whom he could now pass it on? As a *Yorkshire pensioner* had just lost her part-time job through Mr. Butler's credit squeeze, two more readers came together. An *Essex reader* sends a copy to someone who needs it in the *West Indies;* another to an *invalid in hospital* until he had recovered. A *bricklayer* saw to it that his mate never went without whilst doing *National Service.* May Donations totalled:

£30 8s. 8d.

REGULAR CONTRIBUTIONS came from: J.H., 'Ipswich', 5s; Anon, 'Whitchurch', 1s; 'California' in memory of Dr. Norman Bethune, Canada, £1; 'A Highgate Reader', £2; The Humphreys Family, 4s; M. Philibert, 10s; A.M.T. for Fernando and Guilherme, Portugal, 1s; Personal Greetings from U.S.A., £3; Tam O'Shanter, Grey Mare and Foals (pre-paid); J. A. Smith, 2s 6d; S. Mill, 10s; 'Republican', 2s 6d; H.G.B., 2s 6d; R. McLeod, 5s; D. Rees, 10s; Olivia Greene, £2; Royston Green, 7s; E. D. McCallum, 5s; R F.B., £3; D. M. Clarke, 10s; T.W.R., £1; L'Humanité, 3s; D. H. Strathern and Friends, 5s; T. Flood, 2s 6d; H. Tinkler, 5s; D. Smith, 5s; 'Socialist Sailor', £1; E.J.B., 10s; P. N. Brinson, 10s; J. A. Purton, 7s 6d; S. Morrissy, 10s.

OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS include: J. McKinnon, £1; A. Attwood, 15s 9d; R. Beech, 1s 6d; J. Tuck, 15s 9d; M. Young, £1 0s 6d; S. Craven, 2s; C. A. Moore, 2s; A. S. Dopson, 2s; Anon, London, 1s; M. Hill, 5s; J. Smith, 3s; L. E. Bond, 6s; G. Hall, 4s; R. N. Milton, £1; C. G. R. Small, 3s; P. W. Burton, 1s; 'Birkenhead', 10s; B. H. Steel, 12s; N. Hamlin, 3s; G. Cole, 6d; W.C.B. (Canada), 2s 6d; P. Tregidga, 2s; H.V.T.A., 14s 3d; Anon, 2s 6d; J.W. (U.S.A.), 10s 6d; H.T.S. (Canada), £1 15s 5d.

Our thanks to you all.
Co-op. No. L99482.

ANGELA TUCKETT,
134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHY NOT BY POST ?

NAME .....
(Please use block capitals)

ADDRESS .....

.....

.....

I enclose 18s. (home) $3.00, if first class mail $3.50 (U.S.A. and Canada). 19s. (elsewhere) for year's subscription from the .....issue.

(SIGNED) .....

To LABOUR MONTHLY
134, BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3

LABOUR RESEARCH

July issue includes :

"How Much Automation?"
"Two Years of Cyprus"
"Pensions could be raised"

Monthly 9d.; p.a. 10s. 6d.

LABOUR RESEARCH DEPARTMENT
2 Soho Square, London, W.1.

FROM PROGRESSIVE U.S.A.

To you - By air

£2 a year. Introductory offer : 26 weekly issues for 15s. only.

NATIONAL GUARDIAN

Order from : Cedric Belfrage
(Editor-in-Exile),
16 Talbot Square, London, W.2.

FOR THE MIDGET

Send a Midget Labour Monthly with the 4-months-for-3 trial sub. to :—

Name .....

Address .....

Mention that I could book the order through my usual agent (*delete if inapplicable*)

I enclose 3d. towards cost

Signed .....

Address .....

FOR SPECIMEN COPIES

Please send a free specimen copy of the .....issue to :—

(1) Name .....

Address .....

(2) Name .....

Address .....

You may mention my name, or/I enclose note to be sent on.

Signed .....

Address .....

.....

TO THE MANAGER, 134, BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED